

**DRAFT--**  
**June 30,**  
**2010**

**WTP POTENTIAL OPEN ISSUES TASK LIST**

Research and Development

30-Jun-10

Original list prepared July 9, 2009

**NOTES -** The Project has just over \$200M at risk for startup and operations  
The following list of 2010 items has not been screened and is not prioritized.  
Prime owner shown for task is estimate by WLT  
Issues listed are intended to: 1- improve plant ops, 2- reduce S & C risk, 3- reduce dollars.  
Issues that were again brought up but first identified in 2009 are shown bolded in the 2009 list below.

| <u>New Task<br/>Number</u>                                      | <u>Original<br/>PETD<br/>Number</u> | <u>Title</u>                            | <u>Status as of June 30,<br/>2010</u> | <u>Description</u>  | <u>Comments</u>  | <u>Suggested or Actual<br/>Prime Owner</u> |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| The following tasks were identified in the 2010 process review. |                                     |   |                                       |   |  |  |
| <b>2010 TECHNICAL ISSUES -</b>                                  |                                     |   |                                       |   |  |  |
| 1   | N/A                                 | Improved Efficiency<br>HLP-22 PJM Array | On-hold?                              | Improve the efficiency of the HLP-22 PJM array thereby reducing Engr and fab costs while improving mixing robustness. This would provide cost savings and risk reduction. | The design changes made to HLP-22 are inefficient and therefore require excess PJMs. A center array should be tested. This was suppose to be part of post M3 closure optimization. | Engr & Ops Process Tech (R&T)              |
| 2   | N/A                                 | Improved Efficiency<br>UFP-1 PJM Array  | On-hold?                              | Improve the efficiency of the UFP-1 PJM array thereby reducing Engr and fab costs while improving mixing robustness. This would provide cost savings and risk reduction.  | The design changes made to UFP-1 are inefficient and therefore require excess PJMs. A center array should be tested. This was suppose to be part of post M3 closure optimization.  | Engr & Ops Process Tech (R&T)              |
| 3   | N/A                                 | Non-Newtonian Mixing test               | Being evaluated by the TSG            | Demonstrate adequate mixing and bottom clearing with settling solids in a non-Newtonian slurry. Especially needed under   | Special review team chaired by Dr. Wilmarth, SRNL, was brought in to evaluate this topic.  | Engr/Process Ops Tech (R&T)                |

| <u>New Task<br/>Number</u> | <u>Where is it Listed<br/>and/or Tracked?</u> | <u>If Dispositioned<br/>and Closed.<br/>Where is it<br/>Documented?</u> | <u>Status<br/>CS/R/WL</u> | <u>Commissioning<br/>Impact<br/>Y/N</u> | <u>High<br/>Priority "X"</u> | <u>Comments</u> |
|----------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------------|
|                            |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
|                            |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
|                            |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 1                          |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 2                          |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 3                          |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Original PETD Number</u> | <u>Title</u>  | <u>Status as of June 30, 2010</u> | <u>Description</u>  | <u>Comments</u>   | <u>Suggested or Actual Prime Owner</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| 4                      | N/A                         | PJV Capacity Evaluation                               | ?                                 | Evaluatue the adequacy of the PJV system to handle PJM exhaust. Need review of the complete air system.   | Does continous mixing mean continous or is air flow stopped at times to enable other tanks to mix. Is this part of M3 post closure                            | Engr                                   |
| 5                      | N/A                         | PJM air use strategy and operating plan review        | ?                                 | Need to review the PJM air use plan to ensure all tanks are mixed adequately and consistently.  | Have PJM operational restrictions been established due to limited air capacity?   | Engr                                   |
| 6                      | N/A                         | Air System Review for Accumulator capacity            | ?                                 | Are more accumulators needed in the air system? Can the air system provide what is needed with the many changes that have been made?  | Should be part of the air system review.  | Engr                                   |
| 8                      | N/A                         | Temp and Molarity Impacts on RF Resin                 | Data being analyzed               | Analyze RF test data for temp/molarity impacts on RF life and capacity. Recent test data as part of M6 process limits indicates a reduced operating range at  | Need to access for throughput and cost impact if resin life is reduced.   | Ops Process Tech (R&T)                 |
| 9                      | N/A                         | PT M6 Process Limits Evaluation                       | Scheduled to start in July        | Conduct M6 Process Limits review for PT process. PT process limits assessment was not done pending resolution of the flowsheet  | With leaching now targeted for UFP-2 and all the CNP/CXP changes, the process limits review must be done. Cooling may also be needed.                         | Ops Process Tech (R&T)                 |
| 10                     | N/A                         | Heel Pump out Demo                                    | Part of large scale demo?         | Demonstrate performance of heel pumpout system. Do it now vs startup and reduce S/U time and risk. Include test of boroscope and camera.  | How many tanks are impacted? What do in tanks which do not have it? Include as part of large scale demo.  | Ops Process Tech (R&T)                 |
| 11                     | N/A                         | Process Control and pipe hangers design review        | Being worked?                     | Process Control and pipe hangers design review based on higher than 1.5 spg pumped out of tanks intially. Due to marginal mixing, the tanks will have a skewed concentration gradient with much heavier concentrations at the bottom of the | If spg limits are established as part of process control, impact on ops and throughput must be accessed.  | Engr                                   |
| 12                     | N/A                         | Sampling, Process limits and Systems Operating Review | ?                                 | A systems review is needed of the WTP process to examine for the practicality of operations with all the process requirements.  | A step by step walk-through is needed to examine if the proper samples, lab time, instrumentation, etc enable the plant to be adequately                      | Ops                                    |
| 13                     | N/A                         | Process control and product quality review            | ?                                 | Sampling and lab time could exceed allowable time. Can process be kept within limits with current controls?   | Is more or alternate lab space and support needed?  | Ops                                    |
| 14                     | N/A                         | PT samplers Demonstration.                            | Part of large scale demo?         | Sampling streams with solids and settling solids is difficult especially with non homogeneously mixed vessels. Need to determine accuracy and bias of samplers with several feeds. Reduces startup risk.                                    | Test (P9) of Vit system samplers resulted in several changes and that stream was homogeneous. The PT stream is not homogeneous. Demo in the large scale test. | Ops Process Tech (R&T)                 |

| <u>New Task<br/>Number</u> | <u>Where is it Listed<br/>and/or Tracked?</u> | <u>If Dispositioned<br/>and Closed,<br/>Where is it<br/>Documented?</u> | <u>Status<br/>CS/R/WL</u> | <u>Commissioning<br/>Impact<br/>Y/N</u> | <u>High<br/>Priority "X"</u> | <u>Comments</u> |
|----------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------------|
| 4                          |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 5                          |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 6                          |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 8                          |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 9                          |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 10                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 11                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 12                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 13                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 14                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Original PETD Number</u> | <u>Title</u>                                    | <u>Status as of June 30, 2010</u>                 | <u>Description</u>  | <u>Comments</u>   | <u>Suggested or Actual Prime Owner</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 15                     | N/A                         | Rheology Control Demonstration                  | Part of large scale demo?                         | Define and demonstrate PT rheology control scheme to keep yield strength within limits especially if it needs to be controlled within specific limits to prevent settling. Need to account for dilutions, flushes, etc. Evaluate additives and margins.                                       |   | Engr                                   |
| 16                     | N/A                         | Weight percent control Demonstration            | ?   | How control weight percent?   | Needed for several tanks  | Engr                                   |
| 17                     | N/A                         | Product Quality in a Timebased Control System   | Fall back if other control schemes are inadequate | Lack of adequate samples, inadequate level detection, and bubbler ops problems means a timebased system may be implemented.   | The rheology of materials is time dependent. If used, how will this be factored into the control scheme for |  |
| 18                     | N/A                         | Pu Control Plan                                 | ?   | While Pu with adsorbers may not be an issue, if the PuO2 crit limit of 200 grs/vessel is to be protected, will all incoming samples have to be analyzed for this? How?  |   |  |
| 19                     | N/A                         | CNP Mass Balance Assessment                     | ?   | Review CNP mass balance. It appears that the the CNP evaporator will use more nitric than it recovers.  |   | Engr/Ops                               |
| 20                     | N/A                         | Nitric Acid addition in Caustic Tank Evaluation | ?   | Review the safety of adding nitric acid to the caustic HLP27/28 tanks. An exothermic reaction will occur. Has the exothermic reaction been evaluated or will another neutralizing process step be added?  | Has this been reviewed? Is cooling or other measures needed?  | Engr                                   |
| 21                     | N/A                         | LAW HEPA LIFE Evaluaiton                        | ?   | With the scrubbers removed, the LAW HEPA life appears to be less than a month. Frequent maintenance and change out will reduce throughput.  | What is projected HEPA life?  | Ops                                    |
| 22                     | N/A                         | Large Particle Disposition                      | ?   | Define how large particles will be dispositioned in every tank. Will particles be ignored, pumped out, assumed not to come, etc?? Define the plan.  |   | Engr/Ops Tech (R&T)                    |
| 23                     | N/A                         | Contract, R&T Plan, and Addendums Scrub         | Will start in July                                | Review, list, and provide disposition of each issue listed R&T have been dispositioned.   | This will need to be done as part of an MSA for the ORR.  | Ops Process Tech (R&T)                 |
| 24                     | N/A                         | Melter Gas Addition Evaluation                  | ?   | Evaluate materials of melter riser material due to addition of Argon gas (causes reducing environment). Argon gas has been added to help prevent foaming in the riser and improve pour control but this creates a reducing environment which can negatively effect platinum. Platinum is only | Use another gas?  | Engr                                   |

| <u>New Task<br/>Number</u> | <u>Where is it Listed<br/>and/or Tracked?</u> | <u>If Dispositioned<br/>and Closed.<br/>Where is it<br/>Documented?</u> | <u>Status<br/>CS/RWL</u> | <u>Commissioning<br/>Impact<br/>Y/N</u> | <u>High<br/>Priority "X"</u> | <u>Comments</u> |
|----------------------------|---|---|--------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------------|
| 15                         |   |   |                          |   |                              |                 |
| 16                         |   |   |                          |   |                              |                 |
| 17                         |   |   |                          |   |                              |                 |
| 18                         |   |   |                          |   |                              |                 |
| 19                         |   |   |                          |   |                              |                 |
| 20                         |   |   |                          |   |                              |                 |
| 21                         |   |   |                          |   |                              |                 |
| 22                         |   |   |                          |   |                              |                 |
| 23                         |   |   |                          |   |                              |                 |
| 24                         |   |   |                          |   |                              |                 |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Original PETD Number</u> | <u>Title</u>   | <u>Status as of June 30, 2010</u>               | <u>Description</u>   | <u>Comments</u>  | <u>Suggested or Actual Prime Owner</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| 25                     | N/A                         | System descriptions Upgrades   | ?   | With the many changes to the flowsheet (UFP-2 leaching, CNP/CXP, temp changes, etc), the system descriptions need a thorough review. Need to ensure that Ops Tech (Ops Tech (Ops Tech (R&T))) process knowledge and recs are included. | A PIER in 2009 required R&T to review process description sections. This has not been done to any great extent. Process descriptions not only capture knowledge but also provide input for operating procedures. | Ops Process Tech (R&T)                 |
| 26                     | N/A                         | Review all materials of construction especially in pumps and control valves. Rubber used in many places. | ?   | The transfer pump to HLP-27/28 has rubber casing liner which will not be suitable in a rad environment. Need to check all similar and associated equipment.  | Rubber does not hold up in rad environment.  | Engr                                   |
| 27                     | N/A                         | CXP 4 tank system control demonstration  | ?   | Need confirmation of control scheme to ensure no precipitation or throughput restraints exist. Mitigates startup risk and  | Test in PEP?   | Engr/Ops Tech (R&T)                    |
| 28                     | N/A                         | Inline or at-line process control evaluation   | ?   | Added sampling and process knowledge requirements have grown as the process has been worked on. Inline or atline sample analysis and controls can reduce lab work and improve controls.  | This could greatly aid operations, throughput, and quality.  |  |
| 29                     | N/A                         | Interface and WAC sample Analysis Requirements   | Active  | Need to ensure all needs are met. Need to evaluation RDQO, ICD-19, M-1, M3, prequal, etc to ensure appropriate samples taken and analysis done.  | Need WRPS involvement  | Ops                                    |
| 30                     | N/A                         | LAW canister decon demo.   | Been discussed before. Final decision not made. | Identified as an issue in the TMP/TRA.   | How representative is the data to actual conditions?   | Ops                                    |
| 31                     | N/A                         | LAW lid attachment.  | Been discussed before. Final decision not made. | Change design to welded LAW lids so that contamination potential is reduced. Replace push in lids with welded lids. Why take a chance with contamination? Identified as an issue in the TMP/TRA.                                       | Data indicated that one in five cansisters had leaking head issues. This will impact throughput.   | Engr                                   |
| 32                     | N/A                         | Expanded Waste Characterization  | On-hold pending RDQO and non-Reg DQO            | Improve waste characterization data on particle size, solubilities, settling velocities, etc. This will greatly aid plant operations   | Include data needs in sample analysis planning (RDQO, ICD, crit samples)   | Ops Tech (R&T)                         |
| 33                     | N/A                         | Filter Cleaning with Oxalic Acid.  | ?   | Define filter cleaning steps and how oxalic acid will be used. Nitric acid in PEP was not very effective in PEP. Oxalic acid was. Need to ensure this is added to the plant process and properly reviewed.                             | Oxalic works best on iron. If oxalic acid was needed in PEP why does the plant not have it permanetly installed?   | Engr/Ops                               |

| <u>New Task<br/>Number</u> | <u>Where is it Listed<br/>and/or Tracked?</u> | <u>If Dispositioned<br/>and Closed,<br/>Where is it<br/>Documented?</u> | <u>Status<br/>CS/R/WL</u> | <u>Commissioning<br/>Impact<br/>Y/N</u> | <u>High<br/>Priority "X"</u> | <u>Comments</u> |
|----------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------------|
| 25                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 26                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 27                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 28                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 29                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 30                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 31                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 32                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 33                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |



| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Original PETD Number</u> | <u>Title</u>                            | <u>Status as of June 30, 2010</u>                                | <u>Description</u>   | <u>Comments</u>  | <u>Suggested or Actual Prime Owner</u>          |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| 34                     | N/A                         | Caustic Use Optimization                | ?  | Review and optimize caustic usage in light of lower leaching temp. Part of contract stretch incentive fees.  | Lower temps will impact boehmite leaching. Why add caustic for it? Need to work on plans for stretch | Ops Tech (Ops Tech (Ops Tech (Ops Tech (R&T)))) |
| 35                     | N/A                         | Recycled Permanganate Evaluation        | ?  | Review impact of recycled MnO <sub>4</sub> on process rheology and precipitation. Recycled NaMnO <sub>4</sub> could cause precipitation due to being a   | Will peroxide be added to neutralize the permanganate? If so, how much? Should Cr be underleached?   | Ops Tech (Ops Tech (Ops Tech (R&T)))            |
| 36                     | N/A                         | Waste Loading Improvements              | DOE had program in 2009. Need update and definition of our role. | Part of contract tech incentives. Improve LAW and HLW waste loading with respect to Cr, waste, and crystal formation (liquidus temp). Will improve throughput.   | Part of stretch challenges. ORP has waste loading programs underway?                                 | Ops Tech (Ops Tech (R&T))                       |
| 37                     | N/A                         | Technicium Effluent Evaluation          | Been discussed but no action outlined.                           | Evaluate Tc limits, recycle, and disposition as it appears that Tc exceeds ETF limits. Tc removal was eliminated from the flowsheet due to the assumption that the Tc would go into glass. This has been shown to be an inaccurate assumption. Needs | Expand ETF, reintstitute Tc removal?   |   |
| 38                     | N/A                         | Filter Fouling                          | ?  | Develop procedures to prevent biological induced fouling and corrosion of the filters. This was a problem in PEP.  | Needed for both startup and layup  | Ops Process Tech (R&T)                          |
| 39                     | N/A                         | Filter startup and cleaning procedure.  | ?  | The PEP startup demonstrated what will happen with residual materials in the system. Guarding against this and outlining cleaning procedures are needed. Also need to consider having no filters in place during parts of startup and commissioning. | See PEP experience   | Ops   |
| 40                     | N/A                         | Effect of Air Temps on PJMs             | ?  | Evaluate thermo heating and cooling within PJMs and the effect on buildups and structural integrity. Internal air temps will vary greatly due to compression and expansion. This could impact deposition as  | Need an evaluation   | Engr  |
| 41                     | N/A                         | Startup and Commission Simulant Program | To start in July   | Defining requirements, developing the simulants, vendor tests, vendor quals, transportation and disposition all need to be defined. Also how to minimize amount and synergy with other testing needs definition.                                     | This is a complicated program that needs much planning. Could involve one or multiple simulants.     | Ops Process Tech (R&T)                          |
| 42                     | N/A                         | Suction/dilution test demo              | Part of large scale demo?  | Dilution in suction lines is a common practice, however, controlling rheology and process sampling requirements are special  | Reduces startup test time and risk.  | Engr & Ops Process Tech (R&T)                   |

| <u>New Task<br/>Number</u> | <u>Where is it Listed<br/>and/or Tracked?</u> | <u>If Dispositioned<br/>and Closed,<br/>Where is it<br/>Documented?</u> | <u>Status<br/>CS/R/WL</u> | <u>Commissioning<br/>Impact<br/>Y/N</u> | <u>High<br/>Priority "X"</u> | <u>Comments</u> |
|----------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------------|
| 34                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 35                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 36                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 37                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 38                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 39                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 40                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 41                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |
| 42                         |   |   |                           |   |                              |                 |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Original PETD Number</u> | <u>Title</u>             | <u>Status as of June 30, 2010</u> | <u>Description</u>  | <u>Comments</u>  | <u>Suggested or Actual Prime Owner</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 43                     | N/A                         | Particle Size Reduction  | Nothing planned at this time?     | Provide particle size reduction into WTP to provide for more robust plant   | Can be done by mechanical means ahead of HLP-22 or by using HLP-22 as a separations tank. West Valley did it and SRS is planning to do it. | Engr & Ops Process Tech (R&T)          |
| 44                     | N/A                         | Particle Size Definition | ?                                 | Clearly define what is the basis of the particle sizing used in all phases of design so that it can clearly be evaluated should future work change the particle size.   |  | Engr                                   |
| 45                     | N/A                         | Large Scale Demo         | Part of M3 Closure follow tasks   | Conduct large (full) scale vessel test to confirm scaling, sampling, and PJM controls   | Need to demonstrate process control, sampling, and scale up mixing adequacy.   | Engr & Ops Process Tech (R&T)          |
| 46                     | N/A                         | Pu and Am Dissolution    | ?                                 | Based on the decisions for CXP solids resolution, it may be necessary to do additional studies/testing of oxidative leaching for prevention of dissolution of Pu and Am. The solution to prevent solids precipitation includes performing filtration, washing, etc at elevated temperatures of about 45 deg. C. Most testing of oxidative leach has been done at 25 C. However there are tests done at higher temperatures up to 80 degrees C. These test has shown that chromium, Pu and Am increase in dissolution at the higher temperatures. We made need additional studies for oxidative leaching at 45 degrees to show that we don't dissolve Pu and Am to such an extent that we now have a problem in CXP. CNP | Suggested by E. Lee. Needs to be examined in the Haz Ops review.   |  |

**The following issues were identified in 2009 as needing attention. The bolded issues were again identified in the 2010 review. They are separated into 3 groups.**

| <b>2009 Technical Issues - Engineering</b> |   |  |  |   |   |   |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| 1  | 5 | Provide capability to change out the Demister Pad in the blackcell (gray cell) |  | Could have major impact on design. Need to meet with AREVA.       | Part M6-CNP Program.                        | E |
| 2  | 6 | <b>Evaporator Nozzle life extension</b>  |  | Nozzles need 40 year life or backup plan (spare inplace nozzles?) | Relates to the demister pad changeout issue | E |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Where is it Listed and/or Tracked?</u> | <u>If Dispositioned and Closed. Where is it Documented?</u> | <u>Status CS/R/WL</u> | <u>Commissioning Impact Y/N</u> | <u>High Priority "X"</u> | <u>Comments</u>   |
|------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 43                     |   |   |                       |                                 |                          |   |
| 44                     |   |   |                       |                                 |                          |   |
| 45                     |   |   |                       |                                 |                          |   |
| 46                     |   |   |                       |                                 |                          |   |
| <b>The follow</b>      |   |   |                       |                                 |                          |   |
| 1                      |   |   | CS                    | N                               | X                        | Major item if it needs to be done before plant is operated. |
| 2                      |   |   | CS                    | N                               | X                        | Relates to pad change out. Address before startup           |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Original PETD Number</u> | <u>Title</u>   | <u>Status as of June 30, 2010</u>  | <u>Description</u>   | <u>Comments</u>   | <u>Suggested or Actual Prime Owner</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|
| 3                      | 7                           | <b>Improved IX column design so that air is not trapped below the bottom screen.</b> | WTP engr disagrees with Guz Benz on the need for the change.               | resin cap, screen angle to prevent bubble entrapment   | Impacts vendor design. Need to resolve potential for trapped air with Gus Benz. | E                                      |
| 4                      | 42                          | <b>Validate IX H2 Venting System and verify no impacts on IX operations</b>          |  | Might work but will disrupt the IX column. Part of CNP/CXP program.  | Need to confirm system integration  | E                                      |
| 5                      | 8                           | Post Filter/Pre IX Precipitation Resolution  | Design action being taken with CNP/CXP changes.                            | Could have major impact on design  | Part of M6 CXP. Design changes most likely needed.                              | E                                      |
| 6                      | 15                          | <b>Prevention of Suction Line Air Entrainment especially the UFP line</b>            | Much more important now that flowsheet has been changed to UFP-2 leaching. | PEP operation highlighted the concern of air entrapment affecting the NPSH of the UFP suction line. This issue is not limited to just this line. | Need to reevaluate NPSH on critical lines.                                      | E                                      |
| 7                      | 16                          | Prevention of Air Entrainment in filter loop connectors.                             |  | The potential to suck air in through PUREX type connectors as well as HPAV vents should be evaluated.  | Would lead to pumping issues  | E                                      |
| 8                      | 20                          | <b>Define Filter Tube Manufacturing process and vendors.</b>                         |  | Filter flush program found cracked tubes as a result of manufacturing. Need to assign a tech lead to ensure filters are made crack-free.         | Cannot put the ball solely in the vendor's court due to impact on us.           | E                                      |
| 9                      | 21                          | <b>NH4NO3 Stack Emissions Ports evaluation: do enough exist?</b>                     |  | Review if stacks have ample sampling points to detect formation  | Need for qualification  | E                                      |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Where is it Listed and/or Tracked?</u> | <u>If Dispositioned and Closed. Where is it Documented?</u> | <u>Status CS/R/WL</u> | <u>Commissioning Impact Y/N</u> | <u>High Priority "X"</u> | <u>Comments</u>   |
|------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 3                      |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | X                        | Need to ensure robust design - col change out is difficult. May be done. Items include potential to trap air, riser location and design, and distributor nozzle design. |
| 4                      |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | X                        | H2 system could have impacts on IX.   |
| 5                      |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | X                        | M-12 Lessons Learned  |
| 6                      |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | X                        | M-12 Lessons Learned  |
| 7                      |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | X                        | M-12 Lessons Learned. Purex connectors typically leak and therefore will leak air.  |
| 8                      |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | X                        | Need to clearly work with vendor on manufacturing process.  |
| 9                      |   |   | CS                    | Y                               |                          |   |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Original PETD Number</u> | <u>Title</u>  | <u>Status as of June 30, 2010</u> | <u>Description</u>   | <u>Comments</u>   | <u>Suggested or Actual Prime Owner</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 10                     | 24                          | Film Cooler Design Validation                               |                                   | New design has not been tested. Design was changed after half scale testing was complete.          | Need to review new design and decide on testing.  | E                                      |
| 11                     | 30                          | <b>HLP-22 Mixing changes</b>                                | Closed as part of M3.             | Need to define mixing needs. Current design can be significantly improved.                         | M3  | E                                      |
| 12                     | 32                          | <b>Improved level control especially at low Tank Levels</b> |                                   | PJM operation and return flows disturb bubble tube ops   | Level control is key operating parameter  | E                                      |
| 13                     | 43                          | Define UFP Steam Ring Injector Design                       |                                   | How prevent erosion and plugging?  | 40 year life needed   | E                                      |
| 14                     | 47                          | <b>Review Criticality Control Measures</b>                  |                                   | Pu will precipitate during Nitric acid concentration. Review criticality scenarios and mitigation. | Does Cr leaching impact Pu and can NaOH be kept at <.25M. This issue may be closed.                                   | E                                      |
| 15                     | 49                          | Define Fate of Second Phase Organics                        |                                   | Define where second phase goes, ex, antifoam in blend vessel                                       | Are decomposition products soluble? Blend and lag vessels may have 6 month holdup. May be non-issue but where closed? | E                                      |
| 16                     | 50                          | <b>Evaluate potential for Cracking induced by Hg</b>        |                                   | Hg can induce materials cracking in offgas piping  | Has this been looked at?  | E                                      |
| 17                     | 52                          | Improve UFP-2 Temperature control and Response Time         |                                   | UFP2 response times in PEP were too slow   | Need to move thermocouples? Different thermocouples?  | E                                      |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Where is it Listed and/or Tracked?</u> | <u>If Dispositioned and Closed, Where is it Documented?</u> | <u>Status CS/R/WL</u> | <u>Commissioning Impact Y/N</u> | <u>High Priority "X"</u> | <u>Comments</u>  |
|------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 10                     |   |   | R                     | Y                               |                          | Both WV and SRS had problems. WTP tested at half scale and then made design changes.                 |
| 11                     |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | X                        | The M3 program   |
| 12                     |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | X                        | M-12 Lessons Learned. Level control at low levels in PEP was a problem.                              |
| 13                     |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | X                        | M-12 lessons learned. Plugging and erosion a problem.  |
| 14                     |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | x                        | Relates to Myler memo. Testing with real wastes may be needed.                                       |
| 15                     |   |   | WL                    | N                               |                          | Are all decomposition products soluble?  |
| 16                     |   |   | R                     | N                               |                          | Did material specs take cracking into account or only corrosion? Review design. CS if not addressed. |
| 17                     |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | X                        | M-12 Lessons Learned.  |



| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Original PETD Number</u> | <u>Title</u>  | <u>Status as of June 30, 2010</u> | <u>Description</u>  | <u>Comments</u>   | <u>Suggested or Actual Prime Owner</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| 18                     | 53                          | Improve Permeate flow measurement                                 |                                   | As demo'd in PEP, improved meters needed  | What meter is used? May be none issue.  | E                                      |
| 19                     | 56                          | Rad contamination of the steam system via a leak.                 |                                   | Captured here for completeness  | Being reviewed  | E                                      |
| 20                     | 57                          | Rad contamination of the chilled water system                     |                                   | Similar to the steam sys issue (#56) but lower chance   | Should be reviewed  | E                                      |
| 21                     | 59                          | TLP Evap to LAW line pluggage                                     |                                   | Is line pluggage a possibility? Mitigation measures?  | Does M1 address or is this a separate issue?  | E                                      |
| 22                     | 69                          | Demonstration of Melter Power supply system                       |                                   | Alternate wave form to be supplied  | is control demo needed? Refers to power wave form to melter.  | E                                      |
| 23                     | 70                          | <b>Vessel ventilation system balance and impact on operations</b> |                                   | the limited buidling ventilation prevented some vessel mixing changes due to limited capability | Has the system been reviewed now that several years have passed and many changes made?                      | E                                      |
| 24                     | 73                          | Melter feed Radar Level improvement                               |                                   | Radar level monitoring was greatly impacted by foam.  | Is a backup to bubblers needed?   | E                                      |
| 25                     | 76                          | Recovery of IX distributor nozzles.                               |                                   | If IX feed distributors plug, how will they be recovered?                                       | Removing the whole column for just this is a major time consumer but this is a high prob point of pluggage. | E                                      |
| 26                     | 78                          | <b>Post filter precipitation detection</b>                        | Part of CNP/CXP changes??         | Maybe needed despite mitigation approaches  | Plugging the IX column is a bad day   | E                                      |
| 27                     | 79                          | <b>Precipitation detection in the CNP system</b>                  | Part of CNP/CXP changes??         | Maybe needed despite mitigation approaches  | solids are an issue   | E                                      |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Where is it Listed and/or Tracked?</u> | <u>If Dispositioned and Closed. Where is it Documented?</u> | <u>Status CS/R/WL</u> | <u>Commissioning Impact Y/N</u> | <u>High Priority "X"</u> | <u>Comments</u>  |
|------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 18                     |   |   | R                     | Y                               |                          | M-12 lessons learned. Does meter read in units that Ops will use?      |
| 19                     |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | X                        | Active item.   |
| 20                     |   |   | R                     | Y                               |                          | Sister item to previous item. Maybe a ghost but ought to be looked at. |
| 21                     |   |   | R                     | Y                               |                          |  |
| 22                     |   |   | R                     | Y                               |                          | Is demonstration of power wave needed?                                 |
| 23                     |   |   | R                     | Y                               |                          | System needs a review of sizing and capability                         |
| 24                     |   |   | R                     | Y                               |                          | Single Bubbler to be used in addition to radar.                        |
| 25                     |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | X                        | Relates to fines and precipitate. How keep clean or clean if plugged?  |
| 26                     |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | x                        | M-12 Lessons Learned. Don't need if actions taken to address solids.   |
| 27                     |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | x                        |  |

| <u>New Task Number</u>                                    | <u>Original PETD Number</u> | <u>Title</u>   | <u>Status as of June 30, 2010</u>                                      | <u>Description</u>  | <u>Comments</u>  | <u>Suggested or Actual Prime Owner</u> |
|---|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|
| 28  | 93                          | <b>Evaluate possibility for Sodium aluminate silicate formation due to glass formers in recycle.</b> |  | SRS plugged an evaporator with NaAlSi and entrapped 3 critical masses of U when a aluminum rich stream was mixed with a silica rich stream. Relates to task 82.   | Need to closely examine all recycles especially those involving glass formers.           | E                                      |
| 29  | 82                          | Cs Entrapment in Sodium Alumino silicates  |  | Could form after the filter   | Impact LAW?  | E                                      |
| 30  | 83                          | RFD pump demo to show M1 performance   |  | Will an RFD meet the line flow requirements?  | M1 looked at continuous flow. RFDs are pulse flow. Risk mitigator.                       | E                                      |
| 31  | 98                          | <b>M-1 Closure. The Project has never accepted reports #175 and #189.</b>                            |  | In many cases the pipeline design has no margin due to incorrect assumptions and underprediction by the design guide. A fixed Reynolds # cannot be used. The 30% referred is base design, not an optional | PNNL-WTP debate on basis for line design   | E                                      |
| 32  | 19                          | <b>Establish Leaching temperature and Margin for Control</b>   | Testing underway. Test matrix may make temp differentiation difficult. | Safety and basis for 90C max leaching needs to be verified  | Current max is 90C. Lower temp could lead to TP impacts and increased HLW canister count | E                                      |
|   |                             |  |  |   |  |  |
| <b><u>TECHNICAL ISSUES - ENGINEERING/OPERATIONS -</u></b> |                             |  |  |   |  |  |
| 1   | 1                           | <b>Define control of LAW Melter Feed Rheology</b>  |  | Feed can exceed Pascal limits for mixing and pumping  | Was recommended for M6 but not approved. Could dilute feed                               | Ops                                    |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Where is it Listed and/or Tracked?</u> | <u>If Dispositioned and Closed. Where is it Documented?</u> | <u>Status CS/R/WL</u> | <u>Commissioning Impact Y/N</u> | <u>High Priority "X"</u> | <u>Comments</u>  |
|------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 28                     |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | x                        | Initial modeling results show the formation of aluminosilicates                        |
| 29                     |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | x                        |  |
| 30                     |   |   | R                     | X                               |                          | M1 did not investigate line plugging & deposition with pulse flows.                    |
| 31                     |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | X                        |  |
| 32                     |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | X                        | Could impact Al dissolution if temp has to be lowered. Also need to set control point. |
|                        |   |   |                       |                                 |                          |  |
|                        |   |   |                       |                                 |                          |  |
|                        |   |   |                       |                                 |                          |  |
| 1                      |   |   | R                     | Y                               |                          | Dilute feed; use prequal test to identify. Could affect throughput                     |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Original PETD Number</u> | <u>Title</u>   | <u>Status as of June 30, 2010</u>   | <u>Description</u>   | <u>Comments</u>  | <u>Suggested or Actual Prime Owner</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| 2                      | 2                           | <b>Define Control of HLW Melter Feed Rheology</b>                      |   | Feed can exceed Pascal limits for mixing and pumping   | Was recommended for M6 but not approved. Could dilute feed   | Ops                                    |
| 3                      | 3                           | <b>Review route and disposition of IX Resin Fines</b>                  |   |  |  | Ops                                    |
| 4                      | 4                           | <b>Impact of GFC in Recycles - effect rheology and precipitation?</b>  |   | GFC can recycle back to PT via recycles  | Impact on filter   | Ops                                    |
| 5                      | 9                           | <b>Define UFP Process Limits Eval (part of EFRT M6)</b>                |   | Need to do after flowsheet is finalized.   | M6 Phase II  | Ops                                    |
| 6                      | 11                          | Oxalate Recycle Buildup Impacts on Throughput                          | Addressed in CNP/CXP changes  | Oxalate will enter our plant saturated and with solids. The solids will build up in the recycle and reduce throughput                                | Oxalate and other sodium salts will reprecip in the evaporator and be fed back to the front end of PT. They will build up and reduce throughput. | Ops                                    |
| 7                      | 12                          | Phosphate Handling   | Addressed in CNP/CXP changes  | Phosphates will gel which could cause pluggage problems in many areas  | Operating plans to handle Phosphate feeds need to be developed. Possibly additional cleanout ports could be needed                               | Ops                                    |
| 8                      | 14                          | <b>Clean Out Port Review</b>   | Part of M3 closure. Which tanks will have it? Is it practical? What will it really be used for? | Settling solids, phosphates, and process upsets could cause line plugging. Need to review system design to ensure ample cleanout and flushing ports. | Without these, operations could be severely hampered.  | Ops                                    |
| 9                      | 31                          | <b>Line Plugging Recovery Planning</b>                                 |   | Need to resolve potential for line plugging and identify if sufficient cleanout ports exist  | Related to M1 resolution   | Ops                                    |
| 10                     | 17                          | <b>Expanded Glass Compositions- Waste loading during commissioning</b> |   | Need to define glass compositions for feeds between current min glass loading and max AI   | End points are known but not intermediate formulations   | Ops                                    |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Where is it Listed and/or Tracked?</u> | <u>If Dispositioned and Closed, Where is it Documented?</u> | <u>Status CS/R/WL</u> | <u>Commissioning Impact Y/N</u> | <u>High Priority "X"</u> | <u>Comments</u>  |
|------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 2                      |   |   | R                     | Y                               |                          | Dilute feed; use prequal test to identify. Could affect throughput |
| 3                      |   |   | R                     | Y                               |                          | reduces filter life  |
| 4                      |   |   | R                     | Y                               |                          | reduces filter life  |
| 5                      |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | X                        |  |
| 6                      |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | X                        | Could have major TP impact   |
| 7                      |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | X                        | Could have major TP impact IF plugging occurs. Dilute feeds?       |
| 8                      |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | X                        | M-12 Lessons Learned   |
| 9                      |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | X                        | Relates to cleanout ports -- Issue #14.                            |
| 10                     |   |   | WL                    | N                               |                          | Part of Na Reduction program.                                      |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Original PETD Number</u> | <u>Title</u>   | <u>Status as of June 30, 2010</u> | <u>Description</u>  | <u>Comments</u>   | <u>Suggested or Actual Prime Owner</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| 11                     | 23                          | <b>Waste Qual - Plant Ops Needs Integration to ensure scope is incorporated</b>                    |                                   | Identify what testing must be done to validate and verify Waste qual approach | Need to include in test program                               | Ops                                    |
| 12                     | 27                          | GFC Supply Confirmation  |                                   | Need to confirm availability of all GFCs to meet our criteria                 | Some may not available  | Ops                                    |
| 13                     | 65                          | <b>Define how operator knows concentration point has been reached</b>                              |                                   | Needed for operations   | relates to sample and control issue                           | Ops                                    |
| 14                     | 66                          | <b>Define how operator knows when water goes forward or backwards, ie, when at the 3.5M point?</b> |                                   | Needed for operations   | relates to sample and control issue                           | Ops                                    |
| 15                     | 95                          | Melter Operation Demonstration   |                                   | Demonstrate operation without looking into it and standing next to it.        | Relates to plant controls                                     | Ops                                    |
| 16                     | 80                          | <b>How determine eluate and acid purity?</b>   |                                   | Needed to ensure no Cs in acid or contamination.                              | Does current sampling plan address this?                      | Ops                                    |
| 17                     | 64                          | Cr Mass Balance  |                                   | Are impacts of NaOH, acid, MnO4 etc evaluated for Cr.                         | May be closed issue   | Ops                                    |
| 18                     | 51                          | <b>Define Cr Leaching Sample plan</b>  |                                   | More samples may be needed than planned                                       | Goes with sampling question. Can Ops really operate the plant | Ops                                    |
| 19                     | 28                          | <b>WTP Sampling Plan Definition</b>  |                                   | Samples needed for operation and diagnostics need to be reviewed.             | Do enough exist to operate and trouble shoot hot ops?         | Ops                                    |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Where is it Listed and/or Tracked?</u> | <u>If Dispositioned and Closed, Where is it Documented?</u> | <u>Status CS/R/WL</u> | <u>Commissioning Impact Y/N</u> | <u>High Priority "X"</u> | <u>Comments</u>  |
|------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 11                     |   |   | R                     | Y                               |                          |  |
| 12                     |   |   | R                     | Y                               | X                        | Need to initiate supply line confirmation  |
| 13                     |   |   | R                     | Y                               | X                        | Relates to task 40 - how will ops control the plant? Is operating by a calc good enough? |
| 14                     |   |   | R                     | Y                               | X                        | Relates to task 40 - how will ops control the plant?                                     |
| 15                     |   |   | R                     | Y                               |                          | How well can operators operate the melters remotely?                                     |
| 16                     |   |   | R                     | Y                               | x                        | Another control question   |
| 17                     |   |   | R                     | N                               |                          | M-12 Lessons learned   |
| 18                     |   |   | R                     | Y                               | x                        | M-12 Lessons learned   |
| 19                     |   |   | R                     | Y                               | X                        | M-12 Lessons Learned.  |



| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Original PETD Number</u> | <u>Title</u>   | <u>Status as of June 30, 2010</u>                               | <u>Description</u>  | <u>Comments</u>  | <u>Suggested or Actual Prime Owner</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| 20                     | 40                          | <b>Evaluate and Define Instrumentation and Control Measures for Operators</b>                |   | Does enough exist to run the plant based on what we saw in PEP? Can't put your ear next to the tanks to tune the PJMs.                  | Goes with sampling question  | Ops                                    |
| 21                     | 77                          | <b>Reevaluate laboratory capacity if added samples or faster turnaround times are needed</b> |   | Lab could be plant holdup   | ID other lab sources and how to use them to support routine plant ops.   | Ops                                    |
| 22                     | 29                          | <b>Initiation of RF Resin and seed Procurements</b>  | Underway??  | We only own tech for seed to bead manufacture, not seed manu. Microbeads at risk of going out of business                               | Need to buy seeds and beads now to mitigate risk of vendor shutdown. This is a high priority                             | Ops                                    |
| 23                     | 33                          | <b>Define Prequal testing</b>  | "Prequal tests" are being used as capture point for everything. | EFRT Issue M5 defined the need for Prequal feed testing. Need to spec out complete plan. Needs and scope could be bigger than expected. | What will be done, how much feed is needed, where to test, when it is needed, and what to test for has not been defined. | Ops                                    |
| 24                     | 67                          | Where do Prequal testing prior to plant turnover   |   | Plan was to use 222 Lab but recent BNI decision indicated COI   | Can PNNL support? Cost?  | Ops                                    |
| 25                     | 34                          | <b>Improved Filter Cleaning and Microbe control</b>  |   | Need to define cleaning and layup procedures. Need to test with different feeds and sequences   | M-12 Phase II  | Ops                                    |
| 26                     | 36                          | <b>Review and confirm LAW Canister Sealing Method</b>  |   | Press, Weld or Glue? Was defined as < TRL 6. Per DOE data indicate that 20% of canisters will require rework                            | Need to finalize. .  | Ops                                    |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Where is it Listed and/or Tracked?</u> | <u>If Dispositioned and Closed. Where is it Documented?</u> | <u>Status CS/R/WL</u> | <u>Commissioning Impact Y/N</u> | <u>High Priority "X"</u> | <u>Comments</u>   |
|------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 20                     |   |   | R                     | Y                               | X                        | M-12 Lessons learned. Operators cannot go into the plant the way we did with PEP. Relates to #28 and #40. |
| 21                     |   |   | R                     | Y                               | X                        | Need to evaluate in light of samples needed, prequal, etc.  |
| 22                     |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | X                        | Definite high priority. Microbeads survival endangered. We do not own seed technology.                    |
| 23                     |   |   | CS                    | Y                               |                          | Comprehensive testing needed with early batches.  |
| 24                     |   |   | WL                    | N                               |                          | Will current COI prevent use of the 222 Lab?  |
| 25                     |   |   | CS                    | Y                               |                          | M-12 Lessons Learned. Especially important as filters are turned over to Ops from construction.           |
| 26                     |   |   | WL                    | Y                               |                          | Closed issue??? Need to confirm.  |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Original PETD Number</u> | <u>Title</u>   | <u>Status as of June 30, 2010</u> | <u>Description</u>   | <u>Comments</u>   | <u>Suggested or Actual Prime Owner</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 27                     | 39                          | Evaluate water flush frequency in OR model (include HPAV deadleg flushing)         |                                   | Need to define how water additions, dilutions, and flushes effect throughput   | Need final numbers and assumptions to model. Comment of dilute it, flush it, purge it, etc with water are made with little consideration for TP impact. | Ops                                    |
| 28                     | 41                          | <b>Commissioning Feed Development</b>  |                                   | Need to define how many feeds are needed and to accomplish what  | Can they be reused or recycled?   | Ops                                    |
| 29                     | 44                          | <b>Confirm Commissioning Simulant Supply Plan</b>                                  |                                   | How obtain amount, store, remix, etc   | Relates to development issue  | Ops                                    |
| 30                     | 45                          | <b>Outline Commissioning Sim Disposal Plan</b>                                     |                                   | Make into glass?   | other?  | Ops                                    |
| 31                     | 48                          | Verify Carbon Bed Performance  |                                   | Verify performance of carbon by new vendor   | Vendor switched after spec'd  | Ops                                    |
| 32                     | 54                          | Backpulse system optimization  |                                   | Need to define.  | M-12 Phase II   | Ops                                    |
| 33                     | 55                          | <b>Need systems engineering review of systems to ensure integrated performance</b> |                                   | Systems have largely been looked at as stovepipes or individual systems. H2 removal system perf on IX is good example. | Was part of M6 Phase II but got dropped out. Most plant problems are at the interfaces, not within the parts.   | Ops                                    |
| 34                     | 58                          | PWD tank capacity review   |                                   | Are tank volumes large enough with all the planned water additions?  | Throughput impact   | Ops                                    |
| 35                     | 61                          | <b>RF radiation durability</b>   |                                   | Determines life  | To be done at Oak Ridge in M6 Phase II  | Ops                                    |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Where is it Listed and/or Tracked?</u> | <u>If Dispositioned and Closed, Where is it Documented?</u> | <u>Status CS/R/WL</u> | <u>Commissioning Impact Y/N</u> | <u>High Priority "X"</u> | <u>Comments</u>  |
|------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 27                     |   |   | WL                    | Y                               | X                        | Water and oxalate could have big TP impact.  |
| 28                     |   |   | CS                    | Y                               |                          |  |
| 29                     |   |   | R                     | Y                               |                          | Need to address shipping, aging, etc.  |
| 30                     |   |   | R                     | N                               |                          |  |
| 31                     |   |   | R                     | N                               |                          | Need to consider to ensure MAC limits met.   |
| 32                     |   |   | R                     | Y                               |                          | M-12 Lessons learned. M-12 Phase II rec.   |
| 33                     |   |   | CS                    | Y                               | X                        | To date, equipment has been looked at as a stove pipe. Need to do systems interaction review. This is more than process limits. Was dropped out of M-6. Needs to be done |
| 34                     |   |   | WL                    | N                               |                          |  |
| 35                     |   |   | CS                    | N                               |                          | Part of M6 CNP/CXP program. Being done at Oak Ridge  |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Original PETD Number</u> | <u>Title</u>  | <u>Status as of June 30, 2010</u> | <u>Description</u>   | <u>Comments</u>   | <u>Suggested or Actual Prime Owner</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 36                     | 62                          | <b>RF durability in higher caustic</b>  |                                   | NaOH operating range exceeds testing validation range for RF. Hydroxide degrades the resin.  | Tested up to 2M OH. Plant will run at 5M free OH.                         | Ops                                    |
| 37                     | 62A                         | <b>RF resin kinetics affected by viscosity (Na)</b>                                       |                                   | Testing done 4-6M Na. Need to test wider range (3-7M Na).  |   | Ops                                    |
| 38                     | 63                          | <b>RF durability at high temps</b>  |                                   | Resin tested at 25C. Need testing at higher temps (45C). Will test at up to 70-80C.  | Especially needed if heating chosen to address post filter precipitation. | Ops                                    |
| 39                     | 81                          | Test for the impact of Organics and their decomp products on RF resin life and adsorption |                                   | Has previously been suggested.   | Goes with rad and temp testing  | Ops                                    |
| 40                     | 81A                         | RF line pressure if acid form exposed to NaOH   |                                   | A resin plug could develop very high wall pressures if it swells.  | Review potential.   | Ops                                    |
| 41                     | 68                          | Potential for GFC supply line pluggage  |                                   | Was this fully mitigated in earlier testing? What do if plugs occur?   | Closed?   | Ops                                    |
| 42                     | 72                          | Compile Lessons Learned from the 242A Evap startup  |                                   | The TF had much difficulties starting up this evaporator which is the 'same' as ours.  | What were the problems?   | Ops                                    |
| 43                     | 74                          | Key Rad Equipment Removal demo's  |                                   | Should removal of key systems such as IX and filtration be demonstrated via remote ops during cold commissioning? EFRT also questioned this. | Maybe in the plan?  | Ops                                    |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Where is it Listed and/or Tracked?</u> | <u>If Dispositioned and Closed. Where is it Documented?</u> | <u>Status CS/RWL</u> | <u>Commissioning Impact Y/N</u> | <u>High Priority "X"</u> | <u>Comments</u>  |
|------------------------|---|---|----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 36                     |   |   | CS                   | N                               |                          | Part of M6 CNP/CXP program IF we can modify contract via ORP.                                |
| 37                     |   |   | R                    | N                               |                          | Part of M6 CNP/CXP program IF we can modify contract via ORP.                                |
| 38                     |   |   | CS                   | N                               |                          | Part of M6 CNP/CXP program IF we can modify contract via ORP.                                |
| 39                     |   |   | CS                   | N                               |                          | Funding exists in planning packages. Was delayed due to uncertainty with antifoam selection. |
| 40                     |   |   | WL                   | Y                               |                          | Need to evaluate.  |
| 41                     |   |   | WL                   | Y                               |                          | Does prior testing put this to rest?   |
| 42                     |   |   | CS                   | Y                               |                          | TF had issues starting up the evap again. Let's learn from them.                             |
| 43                     |   |   | R                    | Y                               |                          | Need to do for critical equipment. Maybe part of startup plan.                               |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Original PETD Number</u> | <u>Title</u>   | <u>Status as of June 30, 2010</u> | <u>Description</u>   | <u>Comments</u>  | <u>Suggested or Actual Prime Owner</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 44                     | 75                          | Full Scale IX Demo needed  |                                   | After all the discussion and debate on the IX column, should ops be demonstrated with a phosphate feed or other and include all operating steps? | Would be great risk mitigator. Was suggested years ago.                                | Ops                                    |
| 45                     | 84                          | Nitric acid vs NaOH addition protection.   |                                   | Adding the wrong chemical can have grave results   | How is this controlled to prevent it?  | Ops                                    |
| 46                     | 85                          | <b>Develop Simulant of first Hot feed and test it.</b>   |                                   | Risk Mitigator similar to cold simulant test   | Needed especially if hot feed very different from cold simulant                        | Ops                                    |
| 47                     | 86                          | <b>Characterize waste (esp. Gibbsite, boehmite) kinetics, solubilities, and other parameters</b> |                                   | Improves models  | aids planning. Included as M-12 Phase II rec.  | Ops                                    |
| 48                     | 88                          | Improve sulfur leach factors   |                                   | removing sulfur helps melters  | Sulfate removal was once part of the process. Part of M-12 Phase II.                   | Ops                                    |
| 49                     | 89                          | Test Aluminum solubility enhancers   |                                   | aid Al removal   | addresses post filter precip and other issues. Could reduce Na. Part of M-12 Phase II. | Ops                                    |
| 50                     | 90                          | Test impact of Noble metals on leaching processes  |                                   | Could impact   | Closed? Part of M-12 Phase II  | Ops                                    |
| 51                     | 94                          | Confirm first hot feed tank and glass composition  |                                   | Relates to tasks 1,2, 18, 19, and 38   | First tank will most likely change from current plan                                   | Ops                                    |
| 52                     | 96                          | Demo hot repeditive tasks to ensure ALARA is maximized.  |                                   | Need rad test demo facilities  |  | Ops                                    |
| 53                     | 37                          | <b>Canister Decon Validation</b>   |                                   | Was defined as < TRL 6   | Need to demo to mitigate risk?   | Ops                                    |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Where is it Listed and/or Tracked?</u> | <u>If Dispositioned and Closed, Where is it Documented?</u> | <u>Status CS/RWL</u> | <u>Commissioning Impact Y/N</u> | <u>High Priority "X"</u> | <u>Comments</u>   |
|------------------------|---|---|----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 44                     |   |   | WL                   | Y                               |                          | Prior agreements were made that the column would be tested full size. Is that still needed? |
| 45                     |   |   | R                    | Y                               | x                        | Safety and ops issue. Must be part of ops training program.                                 |
| 46                     |   |   | WL                   | Y                               |                          | Is a simulant test of the first hot feed needed? M-12 phase II rec.                         |
| 47                     |   |   | R                    | Y                               |                          | M-12 Phase II rec   |
| 48                     |   |   | R                    | Y                               |                          | Are the factors correct?  |
| 49                     |   |   | WL                   | N                               |                          | Could be part of Na reduction program.  |
| 50                     |   |   | WL                   | N                               |                          | Complete? No effects seen in lab tests.   |
| 51                     |   |   | WL                   | Y                               |                          | Goes with Systems 4A plan involvement below.  |
| 52                     |   |   | R                    | Y                               |                          |   |
| 53                     |   |   | CS                   | Y                               |                          |   |



| <u>New Task Number</u>                                     | <u>Original PETD Number</u> | <u>Title</u>                          | <u>Status as of June 30, 2010</u> | <u>Description</u>  | <u>Comments</u>  | <u>Suggested or Actual Prime Owner</u> |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 54   | 22                          | Tc Effluent and Reduction             |                                   | Tc from WTP will exceed ETF capability requiring expanded capability  | Identify what can be done with Tc in the WTP process. Consider reinstalling the Tc column. | Ops                                    |
|  |                             |                                       |                                   |   |  |  |
| <b><u>TECHNICAL ISSUES - OPERATIONS - OTHER</u></b>        |                             |                                       |                                   |   |  |  |
| 1  | 97                          | Sulfate removal to LAW                |                                   | Sulfate has inverse solubility. Do kinetics support removal when washing?   | Scoping tests indicate that this is not an issue   | Ops                                    |
| 2  | 35                          | Define Evap Capacity                  |                                   | Water addition, caustic changes, solids, all impact evap performance  | Need to define capacity  | Ops                                    |
| 3  | 13                          | G2 Model Resolution                   |                                   | <b><i>N/A for this listing.</i></b><br>OngoingNeed to upgrade to include latest Glass composition, UFP operation, and | Will identify pinch points and TP restraints   | Ops                                    |
|  |                             |                                       |                                   |   |  |  |
| <b><u>TECHNICAL ISSUES OTHER -- TANK FARM AND TPRA</u></b> |                             |                                       |                                   |   |  |  |
| 1  | 18                          | Expanded Glass Compositions - Mission |                                   | Broader formulations are needed to ensure feeds can be handled as the Tankfarm revises the waste delivery plan.       | Tank order and sequence are likely to change thereby impacting operation is year after SU  | TPRA                                   |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Where is it Listed and/or Tracked?</u> | <u>If Dispositioned and Closed. Where is it Documented?</u> | <u>Status CS/RWL</u> | <u>Commissioning Impact Y/N</u> | <u>High Priority "X"</u> | <u>Comments</u>  |
|------------------------|---|---|----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 54                     |   |   | CS                   | Y                               | X                        | Need to confirm the tankfarm's ability to handle WTP Tc.         |
|                        |   |   |                      |                                 |                          |  |
|                        |   |   |                      |                                 |                          |  |
|                        |   |   |                      |                                 |                          |  |
| 1                      |   |   | Closed               | Y                               |                          | Closed. Scoping test showed quick dissolution of sulfate solids. |
| 2                      |   |   | Closed               |                                 |                          | Closed. Modeling shows ample capacity even with added water.     |
| 3                      |   |   | Ongoing              |                                 |                          | Ongoing  |
|                        |   |   |                      |                                 |                          |  |
|                        |   |   |                      |                                 |                          |  |
|                        |   |   |                      |                                 |                          |  |
| 1                      |   |   | WL                   | N                               |                          |  |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Original PETD Number</u> | <u>Title</u>                                | <u>Status as of June 30, 2010</u> | <u>Description</u>   | <u>Comments</u>   | <u>Suggested or Actual Prime Owner</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 2                      | 26                          | K3 Melter Refractory Supply                 |                                   | K3 is now obsolete. Need to identify how it can be obtained. Melter design life is 5 years.                  | K3 is key to current melter design. May need to develop alternate materials.                      | TPRA                                   |
| 3                      | 38                          | Evaluate TF Systems Plan 4A Revision on WTP |                                   | Need to evaluate how it might impact our ability to make \$\$  | need to work with the TF as feed changes and timing could impact WTP start up earnings capability | TPRA                                   |
| 4                      | 46                          | Evaluate LiOH impacts on WTP                |                                   | Evaluate impact on LAW   | New Process. TF has the ball but WTP needs to stay informed so we                                 | TF                                     |
| 5                      | 60                          | Need for front end solids removal on WTP    |                                   | Guards against large solids being sent which could settle. Would also address M-1 and M-3 issues             | Cyclone? Grinder?   | TPRA (TF)                              |
| 6                      | 87                          | Demo Spintek Filter                         |                                   | Backup for crossflows  | Part of M-12 Phase II   | TPRA                                   |
| 7                      | 71                          | Melter Bubbler Placement Optimization       |                                   | Added bubblers were installed in the melter but optimization (flow, multiple heads, etc) was not considered. | Could provide for improved melter capacity and throughput. Want to do before melters go hot.      | TPRA                                   |
| 8                      | 90A                         | Test other simulants on PEP                 |                                   | Use PEP as is and do other tests   | Several reports written   | TF                                     |
| 9                      | 91                          | Expand PEP and do integrated testing        |                                   | TF will own PEP. See report  | Focus on tech issues  | TF                                     |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Where is it Listed and/or Tracked?</u> | <u>If Dispositioned and Closed. Where is it Documented?</u> | <u>Status CS/RWL</u> | <u>Commissioning Impact Y/N</u> | <u>High Priority "X"</u> | <u>Comments</u>   |
|------------------------|---|---|----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 2                      |   |   | R                    | N                               |                          | Longer term issue. Issue includes bubbler tube material also.   |
| 3                      |   |   | R                    | Y                               |                          | Ensure first hot feed tank composition does not change.         |
| 4                      |   |   | WL                   | N                               |                          |   |
| 5                      |   |   | WL                   | Y                               |                          | TF must meet WTP feed spec requirements                         |
| 6                      |   |   | R                    | N                               |                          | M-12 Phase II rec. Tankfarm can consider it. Optimization.      |
| 7                      |   |   | WL                   | N                               |                          | Optimized bubbler placement to be studied with next gen melter. |
| 8                      |   |   | R                    | Y                               |                          | PEP being transferred to TF. WTP needs to maintain involvement. |
| 9                      |   |   | WL                   | N                               |                          | PEP being transferred to TF. WTP needs to maintain involvement. |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Original PETD Number</u> | <u>Title</u>   | <u>Status as of June 30, 2010</u> | <u>Description</u>  | <u>Comments</u>  | <u>Suggested or Actual Prime Owner</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 10                     | 92                          | Expand PEP, make more prototypic, and do integrated testing.                   |                                   | TF will own PEP. This requires higher investment. See report        | Focus on tech and training issues.   | TF                                     |
| <b>OTHER</b>           |                             |  |                                   |   |  |  |
| 1                      | 25                          | SSJ process and 60 Day Process time for New Task > \$600K<br>Needs improvement |                                   | Administratium will slow down schedule especially in time of crisis | <b>N/A to this listing.</b><br>Schedules need ot incorporate this timing need. Preplanning for crisis situation needs to be developed now. | Other                                  |
| 2                      | 10                          | EPD Closure  |                                   | <b>N/A to this listing.</b> Need to resolve final cost and ID funds | N/A to this listing. Could cost an additional \$1-2M   | Other                                  |

| <u>New Task Number</u> | <u>Where is it Listed and/or Tracked?</u> | <u>If Dispositioned and Closed, Where is it Documented?</u> | <u>Status CS/RWL</u> | <u>Commissioning Impact Y/N</u> | <u>High Priority "X"</u> | <u>Comments</u>   |
|------------------------|---|---|----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 10                     |   |   | WL                   | N                               |                          | PEP being transferred to TF. WTP needs to maintain involvement. |
| <u>OTHER</u>           |   |   |                      |                                 |                          |   |
| 1                      |   |   |                      |                                 |                          | Not a tech program but can have big impact on tech.             |
| 2                      |   |   |                      |                                 |                          | \$1.5M allegedly owed.  |